



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,072	04/08/2004	Shinichi Hasegawa	09812.0524-00000	2104

22852 7590 03/06/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

TO, TUAN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/822,072

Applicant(s)

HASEGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan C. To

Art Unit

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being anticipated by Katagishi (US et al. 20020193926A1).

With respect to claim 1, With respect to claim 1, Katagishi et al. an onboard apparatus mounted on a vehicle, which is the navigation apparatus (3) shown in figure 2 of Katagishi et al., said the apparatus (3) comprises an onboard peripheral apparatus (2) for monitoring the failure of vehicle engine and electronic devices (see Katagishi et al., page 2, paragraph 0028, lines 9-11). The onboard navigation apparatus (3) further includes a memory (34), which stores car/position information, manufacture ID, car ID, tracking data (see Katagishi et al, figure 2, memory 34). The onboard navigation apparatus (3) further includes a display device (37) as being connected with the controller (33) for displaying the data stored in the memory device (34) (Katagishi et al.,

Art Unit: 3663

page 6, paragraph 56, lines 5-12). The display (37) displays the design information, for example, the manufacture ID read from the memory device (34) (Katagishi et al., figure 2; page 6, paragraph 0056, lines 5-12). The controller (33) communicates with the memory (34) for display a vehicle information regarding to a vehicle, therefore, Katagishi inherently disclose a recognition means for recognizing a type of a vehicle, based on said vehicle information obtained by said obtaining means.

With regard to claim 2, Katagishi et al. disclose that the vehicle data transmitted from the peripheral apparatus (2) including the manufacturer of the failure parts (Katagishi et al., pages 2 and 3, paragraph 0031).

While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See In re Mraz, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katagishi et al. (US 20020193926A1) and in view of Yuhara et al. (US 20040192189A1).

Katagishi et al. address the limitation of claim 1, however, Katagishi et al. do not disclose a receiving means for receiving recall information and a determination means for determining whether or not the above vehicle is the vehicle to be recalled. Yuhara et al. disclose a vehicle system including a receiver (330) for wirelessly receiving vehicle data including the recall information (Yuhara et al., page 3, paragraph 036., figure 3). The CPU (404) shown in figure 4 coupled to the receiver (330) for processing the received data from said receiver. Thus, the CPU (404) is inherently determining whether or not the vehicle is the vehicle to be recalled. And that the recalled information and other information are displayed via a user interface (334) (Katagishi et al., figure 4).

While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See *In re Mraz*, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).

Hence it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Katagishi et al. to include the teachings of Yuhara et al. to gain advantage therefore (i.e: the vehicle user is alert immediately after his (her) own vehicle has been recalled and thus, the user avoid bad suffering that may be caused from a failure of the recalled vehicle).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant admitted in his response the onboard navigation apparatus disclosed in the reference to Katagishi et al. lacks any teaching of a function setup information storage means for storing related said vehicle information and design information or function information and a display means for displaying design or function read from the function set up information storage means. It is not persuasive since the onboard navigation apparatus disclosed in Katagishi et al. includes a memory means (34) that stores variety of information that relates with an vehicle, for example, the memory (34) stores car/position information, manufacture ID, car ID, tracking data (see Katagishi et al, figure 2, memory 34). The onboard navigation apparatus (3) includes a display device (37) as being connected with the controller (33) for displaying the data stored in the memory device (34) (Katagishi et al., page 6, paragraph 56, lines 5-12). It is important to note that the onboard peripheral apparatus represented in the patent is

Art Unit: 3663

the recited obtaining means since it contains failure detector for monitoring the failure of engine and electronic devices (see Katagishi et al., page 2, paragraph 0028, lines 9-11). In addition, the controller (33) controls to display the vehicle information related to a vehicle via the display (37), therefore the controller (33) is clearly a recognition means that is able to recognize a type of a vehicle and then display vehicle related data via the display (37).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner has found the combination of Katagishi et al. and Yuhara et al. provides the advantage for vehicle operator as the following: the vehicle user is alert immediately after his (her) own vehicle has been recalled and thus, the user avoid a possible accident that may be caused from a failure of a safety device of said vehicle.

### ***Conclusions***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan C To whose telephone number is (571) 272-6985. The examiner can normally be reached on from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

Art Unit: 3663

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/tc

February 26, 2006

  
JACK KEITH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER